



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/704,569	11/03/2000	Herman Rodriguez	AUS9-2000-0488-US1	2337
40412	7590	02/27/2006		
IBM CORPORATION- AUSTIN (JVL) C/O VAN LEEUWEN & VAN LEEUWEN PO BOX 90609 AUSTIN, TX 78709-0609			EXAMINER ROBINSON BOYCE, AKIBA K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3639	
DATE MAILED: 02/27/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/704,569

Applicant(s)

RODRIGUEZ ET AL.

Examiner

Akiba K. Robinson-Boyce

Art Unit

3639

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-10,14,15,18,20-23,25,27,28,30-33,35 and 37-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-10, 14, 15, 18, 20-23, 25, 27, 28, 30-33, 35, and 37-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Status of Claims*

1. Due to communications filed 12/1/05, the following is a final office action. Claims 1, 3-10, 14, 15, 18, 20-23, 25, 27, 28, 30-33, 35, and 37-41 are pending in this application. The previous rejection has been withdrawn, and the following reflects the claims as amended. Claims 1, 3-10, 14, 15, 18, 20-23, 25, 27, 28, 30-33, 35, and 37-41 are rejected as follows.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 3, 18, 20, 28, 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Flake et al (US 5,832,451).

As per claims 1, 28, Flake et al discloses:

Scheduling the travel arrangements using a computer system, (col. 7, lines 23-25, completing travel arrangements);

Recording the scheduled travel arrangements on a nonvolatile storage device connected to the computer system, (col. 7, lines 25-27, stores travel arrangement information);

Sending one or more automated requests corresponding to the travel arrangements from the computer system to one or more service agents,

Art Unit: 3639

wherein the automated requests are based on a traveler's user profile, and wherein at least one of the service agents are selected from the group consisting of a delivery service agent, a telephone system, an electronic calendar system, and a medical information system, (Col. 2, lines 19-24, automatically retrieves, and displays for decision-making by an agent information retrieved from the customer profile, col. 3, lines 42-48, communication between customer and agent is a telephone system)

As per claim 3, 20, 30, Flake et al discloses:

sending includes one of sending an automatic email message, sending an automatic facsimile, and sending an automatic data stream using a predefined protocol, (col. 3, lines 48-50, facsimile machine, providing E-mail communications).

As per claim 18, Flake et al discloses:

one or more processors, (Col. 20, line 51, processor);  
a nonvolatile storage device accessible by the processors, (Col. 20, line 51, coupled to the database);  
a travel automation tool, the travel automation tool including:  
means for scheduling travel arrangements using a computer system, (Col. 20, lines 65-67, shows that the processor generates travel arrangements);  
means for recording the scheduled travel arrangements on the nonvolatile storage device, (col. 7, lines 24-28, using the workstation to store the travel arrangement information in the relational database); and

Art Unit: 3639

means for sending one or more automated requests from the information handling system to one or more service agents, wherein the automated requests are based on a traveler's user profile, wherein at least one of the service agents are selected from the group consisting of a delivery service agent, a telephone system, and electronic calendar system, and a medical information system, (Col. 2, lines 19-24, automatically retrieves, and displays for decision-making by an agent information retrieved from the customer profile in response to a customer's travel request, col. 3, lines 42-48, communication between customer and agent is a telephone system).

The following is inherent with Flake et al:

a memory accessible by the processors.

This limitation is inherent with Flake et al since it is disclosed that information is stored by the processor as shown in col. 22, lines 1-3. Here, it is shown that the processor is further operable to store the integrated inventory information in the database.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 25, 35 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flake et al (US 5,832,451), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Gershman et al (US 6,401,085).

Art Unit: 3639

As per claims 25, 35, 41, Flake et al does not specifically disclose the following, but does disclose receiving automated requests in col. 20, line 55, where a processor is operable to receive a travel request from a customer.

However, Gershman et al discloses:

Receiving the automated request at the electronic calendar system, (Col. 10, lines 62-65, receiving input text in character form indicative of the target meeting, where the input text is generated by a calendar program);

Updating an electronic calendar maintained by the electronic calendar system with information related to the travel arrangements, (Col. 11, lines 15-18, system updates the calendaring system, w/ col. 45, lines 48-56, shows the user can select travel when using a calendaring system to manage daily logistics display in accordance with the embodiment of the invention).

Gershman et al discloses this information in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that travel can be implemented in a calendaring system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to receive automated requests at, and to update an electronic calendaring system with the motivation of using a calendaring system to manage travel information.

6. Claims 4-10, 21-23, 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flake et al (US 5,832,451), and further in view of Levine (US 6,076,121), as cited by applicant.

Art Unit: 3639

As per claims 4, 21, 31, Flake et al fails to disclose wherein the delivery service agents include one or more parcel services, and wherein the automated requests include one of holding packages for customer pickup, delivering packages on a future date, and leaving packages with a neighbor, but does disclose an agent that processes a customer's travel requests in the abstract, lines 7-10.

However, Levine discloses:

wherein the delivery service agents include one or more parcel services, and wherein the automated requests include one of holding packages for customer pickup, delivering packages on a future date, and leaving packages with a neighbor, (col. 2, lines 8-14, [mail or parcel system, where holding packages for customer pickup, delivering packages on a future date and leaving packages with a neighbor are obvious with the system since the system is directed towards a postal business and these types of requests are common and standard in postal operations]). Levine discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that a parcel service can be incorporated into a delivery service agent system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention for an automated request to include one of holding packages for customer pickup, delivering packages on a future date, and leaving packages with a neighbor with the motivation of getting the package to the owner in a reasonable amount of time.

As per claim 5, Flake et al fails to disclose wherein the delivery services include a post office, and wherein the automated holding mail for on a future date address

Art Unit: 3639

requests include at least one of customer pickup, delivering mail and forwarding mail to another, but does disclose a travel service management information system in col. 2, lines 13-17.

However Levine discloses:

wherein the delivery services include a post office, and wherein the automated holding mail for on a future date address requests include at least one of customer pickup, delivering mail and forwarding mail to another, (Col. 2, lines 14-17, [post office and parcel handling offices, where customer pickup, delivering and forwarding mail are obvious with the system since the system is directed towards a postal business and these types of requests are common and standard in postal operations]). Levine discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that post office services can be incorporated into a delivery service agent system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention for an automated request to include customer pickup, delivering and forwarding mail with the motivation of getting the package to the owner in a reasonable amount of time.

As per claim 6, Flake et al fails to disclose wherein the delivery services includes a company mailroom, and wherein the automated requests include at least one of holding mail for future pickup, delivering mail on a future date, and forwarding mail to another address, but does disclose a travel service management information system in col. 2, lines 13-17.

However Levine discloses:



Art Unit: 3639

wherein the delivery services includes a company mailroom, and wherein the automated requests include at least one of holding mail for future pickup, delivering mail on a future date, and forwarding mail to another address, (Col. 2, line 28, [shows sorting which occurs in a mailroom, where holding mail for future pickup, delivering mail on a future date and forwarding mail to another address are obvious with the system since the system is directed towards a postal business and these types of requests are common and standard in postal operations. Levine discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that post office services can be incorporated into a delivery service agent system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention for an automated request to include holding mail for future pickup, delivering mail on a future date and forwarding mail to another address with the motivation of getting the package to the owner in a reasonable amount of time.

As per claims 7, 22, 32, Flake et al fail to disclose wherein the service agents include one or more of the telephone systems and wherein the sending automated requests include configuring instructions corresponding to a telephone, but does disclose a travel service management information system in col. 2, lines 13-17.

However Levine discloses:

wherein the service agents include one or more telephone systems and wherein the sending automated requests include configuring instructions corresponding to a telephone, (Col. 8, lines 45-47, [telephone network], Col. 12, lines 20-35, [assigning FP code represents configuring]). Levine discloses this limitation in an analogous art for

Art Unit: 3639

the purpose of showing that telephone services can be incorporated into a delivery service agent system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to include configuring instructions corresponding to a telephone with the motivation of properly guiding the user for telephone operation.

As per claim 8, Flake et al fail to disclose wherein the configuring requests include at least one of changing a voicemail greeting, forwarding calls received at a first phone number to a second phone number, transferring a caller to an alternate phone number, and providing the caller with an emergency contact, but does disclose a travel service management information system in col. 2, lines 13-17.

However Levine discloses:

wherein the configuring requests include at least one of changing a voicemail greeting, forwarding calls received at a first phone number to a second phone number, transferring a caller to an alternate phone number, and providing the caller with an emergency contact, (Col. 22, lines 37-43, [call forwarding]). Levine discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that telephone services can be incorporated into a delivery service agent system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to include call forwarding in the configuring request with the motivation of guaranteeing a successful telephone connection.

Art Unit: 3639

As per claims 9, 23, 33, Flake et al fails to disclose registering the telephone with an email system prior to the configuring, wherein the registering includes sending a message to the email system, but does disclose an email system in col. 3, lines 49-50.

However Levine discloses:

registering the telephone with an email system prior to the configuring, wherein the registering includes sending a message to the email system, (Col. 1, lines 32-40, [voice signals being carried to the Internet server], col.2 , lines 51-61, [shows e-mail message]). Levine discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that telephone and email services can be incorporated into a delivery service agent system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to register the telephone with an email system prior to the configuring with the motivation of guaranteeing another contact means.

As per claim 10, Flake et al fails to disclose setting a backup contact name, wherein the backup contact name corresponds with an alternate phone number, and receiving a predefined signal from a calling telephone requesting the transferring to the alternate phone number, but does disclose a travel service management information system in col. 2, lines 13-17.

However Levine discloses:

setting a backup contact name, wherein the backup contact name corresponds with the alternate phone number, and receiving a predefined signal from a calling telephone requesting the transferring to the alternate phone number, (col. 22, lines 13-

Art Unit: 3639

25, [translated pseudo-number connection to a temporary intermediate destination/different destination due to signals]. Levine discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that a signal can be responsible for connections to certain destinations]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to set a backup contact name, wherein the backup contact name corresponds with the alternate phone number, and receive a predefined signal from a calling telephone requesting the transferring to the alternate phone number with the motivation of guaranteeing a telephone connection with an available person.

7. Claims 14, 15, 27, 37, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flake et al (US 5,832,451), and further in view of Berman et al (US 5,995,939).

As per claim 14, Flake et al fails to disclose receiving the automated request at the medical information system, and downloading destination related medical information to a computing device that is accessible by a user in response to the received request, but does disclose receiving an automated request in col. 7, lines 4-7, where it is shown that a customer request is routed to an agent by a software-assisted routine.

However Berman et al discloses:

receiving the automated request at the medical information system, (Col. 3, lines 64-67, [create/send service message]);

and downloading destination related medical information to a computing device that is accessible by a user in response to the received request, (Col. 12, lines 24-35,

Art Unit: 3639

[retrieving e-mail addresses for sponsoring systems]). Berman et al discloses these limitations in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that a medical information system can be incorporated into a travel arrangement system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to receive an automated request and download destination related medical information to a computing device with the motivation of properly delivering medical data to a device that is easily accessible by a user.

As per claim 15, Flake et al fails to disclose wherein the medical information corresponds with one or more medical services offered at a travel destination, but does disclose completing travel arrangements in col. 7, line 23.

However Berman et al discloses:

wherein the medical information corresponds with one or more medical services offered at a travel destination, (Col. 2, line 26-31, [correspondence between the office and the testing lab]). Berman et al discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that medical information can be incorporated into a travel arrangement system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention for the medical information to correspond with one or more medical service offered at a travel destination with the motivation of providing means for a user to acquire medical treatment in a reasonable amount of time.

As per claims 27, 37, Flake et al discloses:

Art Unit: 3639

means for receiving/receiving the automated request at a second information handling system, (Col. 3, lines 48-49, shows a second subsystem that a customer can communicate with may be a facsimile, w/ Col. 2, lines 19-24, automatically retrieves, and displays for decision-making by an agent information retrieved from the customer profile in response to a customer's travel request or col. 20, line 55, a processor operable to receive a travel request form a customer).

means for searching/searching a database connected to the second information handling system for requested information, (col. 20, lines 57-58, processor operable to automatically access the database in response to the reception of a travel request).

means for downloading/downloading...information resulting from the searching to a computing device that is accessible by a user, (Col. 4, lines 36-42, shows automated downloading of information).

Flake et al does not disclose that the downloaded information is destination related medical information, however, does disclose downloading information as described above.

However, Berman et al disclose:

Downloading destination related medical information, (Col. 12, lines 24-35, retrieving e-mail addresses for sponsoring systems represents downloading of information, w/ Col. 2, line 26-31, where medical information is shown to be the correspondence between the office and the testing lab. Berman et al discloses these limitations in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that a medical information system can be incorporated into a travel arrangement system.

Art Unit: 3639

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to receive an automated request and download destination related medical information to a computing device with the motivation of properly delivering medical data to a device that is easily accessible by a user.

8. Claims 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flake et al (US 5,832,451), and further in view of Felger (6,553,108).

As per claims 38-40, Flake et al fails to disclose wherein one of the automated requests results in increasing an user's electronic wallet balance and decreasing a user's bank account balance, the user corresponding to the travel arrangements, but does disclose completing travel arrangements in col. 7, line 23.

However, Felger discloses:

wherein one of the automated requests results in increasing an user's electronic wallet balance and decreasing a user's bank account balance, the user corresponding to the travel arrangements, (Abstract, lines 1-32, [request received from user and information associated with a credit account requested, and charging the user's credit account, w/ Col. 13, lines 61-66, [where the credit account is shown to be an e-wallet to pay a fee. In this case, since the credit account is shown to be an e-wallet, it is obvious that when a fee is presented, the user's bank account, which is associated with the e-wallet is decreased, therefore causing an increase of the same amount in the e-wallet account]). Felger discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that electronic wallets are used to pay fees for value added services.

Art Unit: 3639

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention for one of the automated requests to result in increasing an user's electronic wallet balance and decreasing a user's bank account balance, the user corresponding to the travel arrangements with the motivation of showing that electronic wallets can be used in handling travel arrangements.

### ***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments, see Page 9 of 25 of the arguments, filed 12/1/05, with respect to claims 28, 30-33, 35, 37 and 40 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection of claims 28, 30-33, 35, 37 and 40 has been withdrawn.

10. Applicant's arguments filed 12/1/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As per claim 1, the applicant argues that Flake et al does not teach or even suggest, "sending one or more automated requests corresponding to the travel arrangements from the computer system to one or more service agents, wherein the automated requests are based on a traveler's user profile". However, as discussed in Col. 2, lines 19-24 of Flake et al, a customer makes a travel request, and in response to that travel request, an automated action is taken, thereby making an automated request inherently implemented by Flake et al. In addition, the customer requests are based on the profile since the requests are based on travel-based information that is already in the customer profile. For example, a customer may request a non-smoking seat on



Art Unit: 3639

American Airlines. This type of travel information is in the customer profile under non-smoking preference, and preferred vendor as shown in col. 3, line 65-Col. 4 line 3 of Flake et al.

As per claims 25, 35, and 41, these claims depend from independent claims 18, 28 and 1 respectively, and are rejected for at least the reasons discussed above with regard to independent claims 1, 18, and 28.

As per claims 4-10, 21-23, and 31-33, the applicant argues that there is no motivation to combine Flake and Levine. However, Flake discloses a network involving travel related services. In addition, Flake also introduces a subsystem including a packaging/delivery component that is part of the original network in col. 6, lines 28-37. Levine discloses a basic network where routing occurs, that comprises an origin and a destination point, and links that serve as transportation routes that make delivery of the item possible. Levine introduces a mail or parcel system as a network, which also applies routing of mail from an origin to a destination as shown in col. 2, lines 7-49. Since both patents introduce delivery in a networked environment, these references are therefore combinable.

In addition, the applicant argues that the combination of Flake and Levine do not teach or suggest claims 4-10, 21-23, and 31-33. Specifically, the applicant argues that the combination does not disclose "wherein the delivery service agent includes one or more parcel services...holding packages for customer pickup, delivering packages on a future date, and leaving packages with a neighbor" as disclosed in claim 4, or "wherein the delivery service agent includes a post office, and wherein the automated requests

Art Unit: 3639

include at least one of holding mail for customer pickup, delivering mail on a future date, and forwarding mail to another address, as disclosed in claim 5, or "wherein the delivery service agent includes a company mailroom, and wherein the automated requests include at least one of holding mail for future pickup, delivering mail on a future date, and forwarding mail to another address" as shown in claim 6. However, as already disclosed in the rejection, holding packages for customer pickup, delivering packages on a future date and leaving packages with a neighbor are obvious with Levine since the system is directed towards a postal business (which can be represented by a post office or a postal mailroom) and these types of requests are common and standard in postal operations.

As per claims 14, 15, 27 and 37, the applicant argues that there is no motivation to combine Flake and Berman. However, Flake discloses an automated system for requesting travel-related services, and fulfilling those requests through service agents in col. 2, lines 9-25. Berman discloses an automated request and fulfillment system as shown in the abstract, lines 1-7. Since both patents disclose automated service request/fulfillment systems, these references are therefore combinable.

As per claims 14, 15, 27 and 37, these claims depend from claims 1, 14, 18 and 28 respectively, and are therefore rejected for the same reasons as disclosed with respect to claims 1, 14, 18 and 28. Particularly, in claim 17, the applicants seem to be at a loss as to how Berman's claim 17 has anything to do with downloading destination related medical information in response to receiving a travel related automated request. In Col. 12, lines 24-35, Berman recites retrieving e-mail addresses for sponsoring

Art Unit: 3639

systems in a medical environment. In this case, the e-mail addresses correspond to the destination to which the information will be sent.

As per claims 38-40, the applicant argues that there is no motivation to combine Flake and Felger. However, Flake discloses an automated system for requesting travel-related services, and fulfilling those requests through service agents in col. 2, lines 9-25. Felger discloses an automated service request and fulfillment system, where the customer is billed for the service as shown in the abstract, lines 1-7. Since both patents disclose automated service request/fulfillment systems, these references are therefore combinable.

As per claims 38-40, these claims depend from claims 1, 18 and 28 respectively, and are therefore rejected for the same reasons as disclosed with respect to claims 1, 18 and 28.

### ***Conclusion***

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 3639

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Akiba K Robinson-Boyce whose telephone number is 571-272-6734. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Hayes can be reached on 571-272-6708. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7238 [After final communications, labeled "Box AF"], 703-746-7239 [Official Communications], and 703-746-7150 [Informal/Draft Communications, labeled "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"].

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.



A. R. B.  
February 14, 2006



JOHN W. HAYES  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER